

**City of Minneapolis**  
**CPED - Public Land Sale and Acquisition Form**

**Section I. Property Information**

**PROJECT COORDINATORS COMPLETE SECTION I.**

ENTIRE FORM MUST BE COMPLETED PRIOR TO MARKETING PROPERTY

**PLEASE ATTACH MAP OF SUBJECT PROPERTY AND ALL ADJACENT PARCELS**

Submitted by: Edie Oates

Phone #: 673-5229

Form Initiated Date: 3/4/2010

Complete by Date:           

1. Address: 2640 Colfax Avenue North

2. Property Identification Number (PIN): 09-029-24-44-0154

3. Lot Size: 5,429 SF

4. Current Use: Vacant SF home

5. Current Zoning: R2B

6. Proposed future use (include attachments as necessary): Sale to a non-profit developer for rehabilitation and to provide ownership housing under the NSP Program.

7. List addresses of adjacent parcels owned by CPED/City: None

8. Project Coordinator comments:           

PROJECT COORDINATOR: EMAIL FORM TO JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US

**Section II. Zoning Review**

9. Lot is Buildable for any structure ☒ Non-Buildable for any structure ☐

Explain: Single-family dwellings are a permitted use in the R2B zoning district. The minimum lot area for a SFD in the R2B district is 5,000 square feet.

10. Will any land use applications be required to achieve the proposed future use noted in item 6?

Yes ☐

No ☒

If yes, what applications?           

11. Comments:           

Completed by: Jacob Steen Date: 3/10/2010

ZONING STAFF: EMAIL FORM TO JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US

**Section III. Community Planning Review**

12. List adopted small area plan(s) in effect for parcel: None

13. Future land use/designation(s) identified in The Minneapolis Plan and other adopted plans: Not in a designated area. Property classified "Urban Neighborhood"

14. Is future land use proposed in item 6 consistent with future land use plans?

Yes ☒

No ☐

If no, why not?           

15. Does the City own adjacent parcels that could be combined with this parcel to create a larger development?

Yes ☐

No ☒

If yes, explain possible development scenarios           

16. Is parcel identified in adopted plans as a catalyst/essential site for future development?

Yes ☐

No ☒

If Yes, what type of development?           

Comments:           

Completed by: Tom Leighton Date: 3/12/2010

COMMUNITY PLANNER: EMAIL FORM TO JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US

Planning Director Review

by: Barbara Sporlein Date: 3/15/2010

**City of Minneapolis**  
**CPED - Public Land Sale and Acquisition Form**

PLANNING DIRECTOR:

EMAIL FORM TO [JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US](mailto:JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US)

Multi-Family Housing Staff Comments by: Wes Butler Date: 3/25/2010

Comments: There is support for the development strategy as proposed - rehab.

Single-Family Housing Staff Comments by: Elfric Porte Date: 3/15/2010

Comments: Single family supports the proposed strategy.

Real Estate Development Services Staff Comments by: Darrell Washington Date: 3/15/2010

Comments: Proposed development appears feasible and consistent with real estate policies.

Business Development Staff Comments by: Kristen Guild Date: 3/25/2010

Comments: The property is not needed for economic development purposes.

Economic Development Director Review

by: Cathy Polasky

Date: 3/25/2010

**PLEASE CHECK ONE BOX:**

☒ **PROCEED** to market the property as proposed

Project Coordinator: Contact Community Planner (in Section III) in advance of CD Committee hearing to acquire City Planning Commission finding of consistency with *The Minneapolis Plan for Sustainable Growth*

☐ **HOLD** this property for discussion at next available Director's Meeting

Note: If there is policy conflict or strategic options outlined in this form, this land sale must be discussed at a Director's Meeting so that a decision on whether or not to proceed can be made

Director's Notes (reason for **HOLD** status): \_\_\_\_\_

Housing Director Review

by: Tom Streitz Date: 3/26/2010

EMAIL COMPLETED FORM TO [JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US](mailto:JOSEPH.BERNARD@CI.MINNEAPOLIS.MN.US)

Note: The completed and signed CPED public land form and the Planning Commission action as to the consistency with the City's Comprehensive Plan **must** be attached to the staff report that is submitted to the Community Development Committee.